

MEETING MINUTES
Citizen Advisory Committee

Stantonsburg Road/Tenth Street Connector (Project U-3315)

January 4, 2007

7:00 PM – 9:00 PM

Sheppard Memorial Library, Greenville

Attendees:

Name	Representing	Phone
Ida Williams	Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC)	(252) 752-2552
Aaron Shambley	CAC	(252) 758-0335
Rena Louise Payton	CAC	(252) 752-6108
Bill Sanders	CAC	(252) 752-3641
Louvenia Sutton	CAC	
Isabelle Wicker	CAC	(252) 758-4621
Ozie Hall	CAC	(252) 902-4595
Herbert Corey	CAC	(252) 916-7139
Sammy Pugh	CAC	(252) 756-1946
Louise Duncan	CAC	(252) 758-8881
R.J. Hemby	CAC	(252) 916-0395
Christopher Taylor	CAC	(252) 355-5517
Neil Lassiter	NCDOT Division 2	(252) 830-3490
Tom Tysinger	City of Greenville – Public Works	(252) 329-4520
Merrill Flood	City of Greenville – Planning	(252) 329-4500
Kyle Garner	City of Greenville – Planning	(252) 329-4476
Harlan Britt	Kimley-Horn and Associates	(919) 677-2209
Chuck Nuckols	Kimley-Horn and Associates	(919) 677-2114
Roger Henderson	Kimley-Horn and Associates	(919) 678-4158
Ron Hairr	Kimley-Horn and Associates	(919) 678-4165
Sherrie Wilder	Kimley-Horn and Associates	(919) 678-2110
Meredith Harris	Kimley-Horn and Associates	(919) 677-2108
Dr. Jim Baugh	J.E.B. and Associates	(561) 889-3790
Willie Moore	Citizen	(252) 830-3490
Nancy Harrington	Citizen	
Marion Barnes	Citizen	

Prior to the meeting, attendees were provided with an agenda, a January – February 2007 schedule of events, a summary of the Purpose and Need statement, and an Option Comparison summary describing the nine alignment options. (Options A, B, C, D, E, and F were developed during the January 30-31, 2006 Community Informational Workshop (CIW), and Options G, H, and J were developed by the Consultant team, led by Kimley-Horn and Associates (KHA).) Maps of the nine alignment options were posted on boards for review.

Mr. Tysinger opened the meeting by welcoming attendees and thanking them for their participation. (This is the third CAC meeting.) He gave a brief overview of the items outlined on the agenda and mentioned that there are many activities scheduled for the month of January. Mr. Tysinger referenced the schedule of events, handed out to attendees before the meeting, and the

Option Comparison summary to be discussed later in the meeting. CAC members introduced themselves and told of their interest in (or connection to) the project. Mr. Tysinger introduced Mr. Britt, who then introduced the rest of the Consultant team.

Mr. Britt also thanked the committee members for their attendance and gave a brief project overview. The *Horizons Comprehensive Plan* (approved by the City Council in February 2004), the *Center City – West Greenville Revitalization Plan*, and the *Greenville Urban Area MPO Thoroughfare Plan* (adopted by the MPO in December 2004 and by the NCDOT in February 2005) all show a need for this project (Stantonsburg Road / Tenth Street Connector). This project was initiated with the Consultant team in August 2005, and the first meeting with the CAC was held in November 2005. The second CAC meeting was held in February 2006, and the CAC heard input received from citizens at the CIW and reviewed citizens' sketches and ideas about possible alignment options. Mr. Britt reported that over the past year, KHA has been working on traffic projections, developing the Purpose and Need Statement, completing the environmental screening, and researching community characteristics and historic areas. KHA also reviewed the six alignment options originating from the January 2006 CIW and generated three additional options.

Mr. Britt introduced Dr. Baugh, who discussed the public involvement activities to date. Dr. Baugh wished everyone a Happy New Year and emphasized that although we are entering a new year of work on this project, it is still critical to continue public involvement activities. He noted that this is an open and fair process, and future input from citizens is critical also. A public involvement process was created when the project first began. Since the project's inception, citizens have attended workshops, helped develop vision statements, discussed ideas with the project team, broken into small groups and sketched options, etc. Citizens other than those on the CAC asked questions about housing, met with public officials, and provided input. Dr. Baugh summarized the overview of public involvement activities by encouraging everyone to stay engaged, since continual input allows for a continual process. He then turned the floor over to Mr. Hairr and Mr. Henderson for a discussion of alignment options.

Mr. Hairr referenced the maps posted on boards and the Option Comparison handouts provided to the meeting attendees. Mr. Hairr summarized the alignment options as follows:

Option A: Widen existing roads symmetrically along Farmville Boulevard, Fourteenth Street, and Dickinson Avenue. Create a railroad overpass bridge over the intersection of Tenth Street and Dickinson Avenue. Widen Tenth Street symmetrically to Evans Street.

Pros

- No impact to school property
- Reduced potential impact to historic district

Cons

- Not direct
- Does not maintain connectivity of Dickinson Avenue with downtown
- Not consistent with Revitalization Plan
- Not consistent with Thoroughfare Plan
- Includes several turning movements
- Longer crossing with railroad
- Business/residential relocations likely

Option B: Create a continuous overpass beginning west of Bancroft Avenue and continuing to Tenth Street east of the railroad.

Pros

- Direct
- Maintains connectivity of Dickinson Avenue with downtown
- No impact to school property
- Does not include any turning movements
- Consistent with Thoroughfare Plan
- Shorter crossing with railroad

Cons

- Not consistent with Revitalization Plan
- Higher potential impact to historic district
- Higher cost
- Higher potential impact to the historic district (viewshed)

Option C: Widen Farmville Boulevard to the south, and then use new location, curving north, to Spruce Street. Widen Spruce Street to Columbia Avenue. Use new location from Columbia Avenue to Tenth Street, including a grade separation with the railroad and Dickinson Avenue. Widen Tenth Street symmetrically to Evans Street.

Pros

- Consistent with Thoroughfare Plan
- Consistent with Revitalization Plan
- Does not include any turning movements
- Maintains connectivity of Dickinson Avenue with downtown
- Reduced potential impact to historic district

Cons

- Impacts school property
- Longer crossing with railroad
- Business/residential relocations likely

Option D: Widen Farmville Boulevard, and then use new location, curving south, to Tenth Street. Includes a grade separation with the railroad and Dickinson Avenue. Widen Tenth Street symmetrically to Evans Street.

Pros

- Does not include any turning movements
- Direct
- Maintains connectivity of Dickinson Avenue with downtown
- Consistent with Thoroughfare Plan
- Consistent with Revitalization Plan
- No impact to school property

Cons

- Business/residential relocations likely
- Longer crossing with the railroad
- Potential impact to historic property

Option E: Use Memorial Drive symmetrically from Stantonsburg Road to MLK, Jr. Drive. Widen MLK, Jr. Drive to the south from Memorial Drive to McKinley/Ward Street. On new location, connect MLK, Jr. Drive from McKinley/Ward Street to Tenth Street, using a grade separation with the railroad. Widen Tenth Street symmetrically to Evans Street.

Pros

- No impact to school property

Cons

- Not direct

Pros, continued (Option E)

- Reduced potential impact to historic district

Cons, continued (Option E)

- Does not maintain connectivity of Dickinson Avenue with downtown
- Not consistent with Revitalization Plan
- Not consistent with Thoroughfare Plan
- Longer crossing with the railroad
- Business/residential relocations likely
- Requires turning movement

Option F: Beginning at Moye Boulevard and Stantonsburg Road, widen Moye Boulevard symmetrically southeast to Chestnut Street. Beginning approximately at Chestnut Street, cut across on new location to the east/northeast to connect to Dickinson Avenue. Widen Dickinson Avenue to the south to Tenth Street, and create a grade separation with the railroad with Dickinson Avenue to Tenth Street as the major movement. Widen Tenth Street symmetrically to Evans Street.

Pros

- No impact to school property
- Reduced potential impact to historic district

Cons

- Not direct
- Does not maintain connectivity of Dickinson Avenue with Downtown
- Not consistent with Revitalization Plan
- Not consistent with Thoroughfare Plan
- Longer crossing with railroad
- Business/residential relocations likely
- Requires turning movement

Option G: Widen Farmville Boulevard to the south, and then use new location, curving north (parallel to Spruce Street) from Fourteenth Street to Tenth Street, including a grade separation with the railroad and Dickinson Avenue. Widen Tenth Street to the north to Evans Street.

Pros

- Direct
- Does not include any turning movements
- Maintains connectivity of Dickinson Avenue with downtown
- Consistent with Thoroughfare Plan
- Consistent with Revitalization Plan
- No impact to school property
- Reduced potential impact to historic district
- Shorter crossing with the railroad

Cons

- Business/residential relocations likely

Option H: Widen Farmville Boulevard to the north, and then use new location from Fourteenth Street to Tenth Street, including a grade separation with the railroad and Dickinson Avenue. Widen Tenth Street to the north to Evans Street.

Pros

- Direct
- Does not include any turning movements
- Maintains connectivity of Dickinson Avenue with downtown
- Consistent with Thoroughfare Plan
- Consistent with Revitalization Plan
- No impact to school property
- Reduced potential impact to historic district
- Shorter crossing with railroad

Cons

- Business/residential relocations likely
- Impacts Beatrice Maye Park

Option J: Widen Farmville Boulevard symmetrically, and then use new location, curving south, from Fourteenth Street to Tenth Street, including a grade separation with the railroad and Dickinson Avenue. Widen Tenth Street symmetrically to Evans.

Pros

- Reduced potential impact to historic district
- Does not include any turning movements
- Maintains connectivity of Dickinson Avenue with downtown
- Consistent with Thoroughfare Plan
- Consistent with Revitalization Plan
- No impact to school property
- Direct

Cons

- Business/residential relocations likely
- Longer crossing with the railroad
- Impacts Beatrice Maye Park

Mr. Hairr and Mr. Henderson explained that NCDOT and FHWA requested to meet with the City and the Consultant team in September 2006 to review the options under consideration. After a review and full discussion, NCDOT and FHWA recommended four of the nine alignment options be considered for further detailed study. The yellow shading on the maps shown today represents a combined right of way corridor width for the four FHWA/NCDOT recommended options (C, G, H, and J). Options G, H, and J are basically variations of the citizen-recommended Option C alignment.

Mr. Henderson suggested that the floor be opened for questions. Marion Barnes (citizen) asked how much of a cost difference there might be between bridging options. The project team responded that costs have not been quantified at this time, but any costs mentioned as higher or lower, relative to each other, describe the overall project.

Christopher Taylor (CAC) asked if residential and business relocations would be limited to one side of the street. Mr. Hairr replied that the number and types of relocations will vary, depending on the option(s) selected, specifically, whether the roadway alignment is to the north, south, or symmetric along the existing centerline. The project team is first trying to narrow down the number of options in consideration, and then KHA will complete functional designs for the

selected options. Based on these designs, the project team can determine impacts from each option.

Mr. Taylor also asked whether Beatrice Maye Park would be impacted, and if so, how much would be taken. The project team responded that exactly how many feet of impact, if any, is currently unknown since functional designs have not been completed. If the alignment option(s) selected for further study are just bordering the park, it may be possible to avoid impacts altogether. CAC members expressed their concern to avoid impacts to Beatrice Maye Park and Sadie Saulter School. Mr. Taylor asked whether the maps would change, and Mr. Hairr responded that the maps shown to the CAC at this meeting would be identical to those shown at the January 30, 2007 CIW.

Louise Duncan (CAC) voiced a concern that future bridging on Tenth Street would facilitate further flooding. She pointed out that the road frequently floods during an average rainstorm. Mr. Tysinger assured the CAC that any hydraulics issues would be taken care of to improve the current situation on Tenth Street.

Ozie Hall (CAC) asked for the current and proposed right of way widths on Farmville Boulevard. Mr. Tysinger answered that the existing right of way width varies between approximately 50 to 60 feet. The proposed cross sections also vary, but the widths shown on the maps presented to the CAC at this meeting measure 145 feet. Mr. Hall asked for a definition of right of way and if properties on both sides of the street might have to be acquired. Mr. Tysinger clarified that a right of way line is the boundary of a citizen's property line and NCDOT's or the City's property. Mr. Tysinger and the project team did not know which specific properties along Farmville Boulevard might have to be acquired. Mr. Hall asked if the recommendations from NCDOT and FHWA to carry forward Options C, G, H, and J essentially eliminate all other options. Mr. Tysinger answered that in their (NCDOT's/FHWA's) eyes, yes, since those agencies hold the project's construction funding.

Mr. Tysinger added that the most prevalent statements from the public have been comments against the widening of Farmville Boulevard and general apprehension about additional costs due to potential relocations. (For example, "If you have to take my house, don't leave me with a higher mortgage. I'm retired and on a fixed income.") He indicated to the CAC that the City is working on a program to supplement NCDOT's regular relocation program in hopes of minimizing the impact of relocation to those owning homes and wishing to remain in the neighborhood to save West Greenville citizens from relocation expenses.

A comment was made concerning the Bojangles restaurant recently relocated to a new building along Farmville Boulevard. Attendees asked if they were provided any information not presented to the public. Mr. Tysinger indicated that Bojangles was developed based on information from the current *Thoroughfare Plan* and TIP.

Rena Louise Payton (CAC) asked about the recent rezoning along Bancroft Avenue and Memorial Drive, in respect to why the City did not rezone all the way to Fourteenth Street. Merrill Flood (City) responded that residences along the south side of Farmville Boulevard were not included in the City's *Revitalization Plan*. Mr. Hall added that this area was rezoned for single-family residences because area residents do not want duplexes built in their neighborhoods.

Isabelle Wicker (CAC) asked whether the City's supplemental relocation program would assist citizens who will be impacted but want to move out of West Greenville. Mr. Tysinger said that

the City is still working out final details of the plan and will hopefully have a draft in the next few weeks. The overall goal of the City's supplemental relocation plan is to increase home ownership in West Greenville.

R. J. Hemby (CAC) asked which of the four recommended alignment options impact Sadie Saulter School. Option C does impact the school, but options G, H, and J do not. Mr. Hemby asked which of the four recommended alignment options take Beatrice Maye Park. Options H and J impact the park. Mr. Hemby asked which of the four recommended alignment options would result in the most expensive bridge. Options C and J would require the longest bridge length, which would be more expensive. Options G and H would require the shortest bridge length. Mr. Hemby requested a list of all properties located within the historic districts.

Mr. Hall asked which alignment option is the closest to the Commercial Node in the *Revitalization Plan*. Mr. Tysinger replied that he was not sure but would check the *Plan*.

Mr. Hemby requested a more detailed explanation in writing of the process by which the project team proceeded to the current decisions. He also asked who at NCDOT made the decisions, citing a conversation with Marvin Blount, NCDOT Board of Transportation member, who is allegedly unaware of the status of the Stantonsburg Road / Tenth Street Connector project. Mr. Tysinger replied that NCDOT staff reached the current decision points with the project team.

Ms. Duncan asked if existing bus routes would be affected. Mr. Tysinger answered that this issue would be studied in the next phase of the project.

Mr. Taylor asked for a clarification of the meaning of "viewshed." Mr. Hairr explained that the State Historic Preservation Office acknowledges that the viewshed from (or of) a historic property is very important. Option B obscures the viewshed, or distorts the current view of the landscape, near and around historic districts. Plus, the proposed bridging of the entire length of the project under Option B is extremely expensive and was not recommended because of cost.

Mr. Barnes expressed concern that the project team had not considered public opinion and that NCDOT and FHWA were uninterested in citizens' input. Mr. Hairr reassured attendees that citizens' input is very important to the process, and in fact, all of the recommended options are variations of Option C, which resulted from the January 2006 CIW. Bill Sanders (CAC) mentioned that he thought that he heard previously that Farmville Boulevard would not be widened. The project team was not sure where Mr. Sanders heard that comment and noted that the recommended options presented at this meeting all correspond to approved local and state plans for West Greenville.

Mr. Sanders asked when a decision would be made on which options will officially become alternatives for further study. The Steering Committee will make a decision and hopes to reach a consensus within the community. The Steering Committee members are Mr. Tysinger, Mr. Flood, George Harrell (East Carolina University), Tim McDonnell (Pitt County Memorial Hospital), and Neil Lassiter (NCDOT).

Mr. Hemby was concerned that NCDOT might take fragments of citizens' property and leave useless remnants of no economic value behind. He asserted that this would not be fair. Mr. Tysinger agreed that it would not be fair to leave a property in worse condition or to cut off entire front yards. He agreed that it is not right to only allow people to park one car in their driveway, though there is a City ordinance that does not allow residents to park cars on their yards. He

noted Mr. Hemby's concern and fully agreed that residents' property should not be left in worse condition after the project than before.

Ms. Payton reiterated Mr. Hemby's concerns that citizens of West Greenville do not hold much trust in the City or NCDOT, based upon prior projects. She asked that the City be fair and truthful. Ms. Payton requested that everyone in attendance, and especially the project team, think about how having to relocate would affect them personally, pray for the right decision, and act accordingly.

Mr. Hemby asked if one of the public walk-in sessions currently scheduled to be held at Mt. Calvary Church could be moved to another location. Mr. Tysinger asked Mr. Hemby to discuss this issue later and make a recommendation for an alternate location.

Mr. Sanders asked if there would be any other alignment options considered, besides the four recommended options presented at this meeting. Mr. Tysinger replied that all input received tonight and the four recommended options would be presented at the January 30, 2007 CIW. Mr. Sanders also asked about the project schedule. NCDOT lists right of way beginning in Federal fiscal year (FFY) 2009 in the TIP and construction for FFY 2011. Federal fiscal years begin in October of the previous year. Ms. Duncan asked how long construction would last. Mr. Lassiter responded approximately 2.5 years.

Ms. Payton asked about future widening on Farmville Boulevard from Bancroft Avenue to Memorial Drive and ownership/maintenance of these streets. Mr. Tysinger replied that Farmville Boulevard is not actually an NCDOT-maintained street, but NCDOT is responsible for buying right of way for TIP projects. Ms. Payton noted that many people are confused about which government entity is responsible for certain things (such as transportation projects and upgrading drainage lines).

Meeting attendees viewed the PowerPoint presentation that will be shown to the public at the January 30, 2007 CIW and were notified that its current duration of approximately 13 minutes will be reduced to approximately ten minutes. Mr. Hemby requested a copy of the presentation. Mr. Tysinger noted that it will be put on the City of Greenville's website for public announcements after the CIW.

Mr. Tysinger thanked CAC members and citizens for their attendance and participation, and the meeting was adjourned at 9:00 PM.